

The State Board of Education/State Board for Vocational Education held a work session on Thursday, February 21, 2013 in the Cabinet Room of the Townsend Building, Dover, Delaware.

Present were: Jorge L. Melendez, Vice President, Gregory B. Coverdale, Jr., G. Patrick Heffernan, Randall L. Hughes, II, Barbara B. Rutt, Dr. Terry M. Whittaker. Donna R. Johnson, State Board Executive Director, was also in attendance. Ilona Kirshon, Deputy Attorney General and legal counsel for the State Board, and Catherine Hickey, Deputy Attorney General and legal counsel for Department of Education, also attended. Christopher Ruszkowski and Eric Niebrzydowski from the Department's Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Unit were presenters.

Vice President Melendez called the work session to order at 9:12 a.m.

DPAS II Component V and Regulation 106A Update

Christopher Ruszkowski and Eric Niebrzydowski from the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Unit provided an update to the State Board on the implementation of DPAS II Component V. This was a follow up discussion from the Board's December retreat and would also highlight the proposed changes to Regulation 106A which are substantive and would change the teacher evaluation process. Mr. Ruszkowski presented highlights of the DPAS II Statewide Plan and the training sessions scheduled in February and the monitoring scheduled for March. He explained that districts will have the opportunity to submit alternate assessments and teacher of record module. There was discussion on teacher observations and the amount of time administrators spend on just one evaluation.

The Board was presented with the proposed changes to Regulation 106A. These changes have been part of a data review and presented to various stakeholders for feedback. Mr. Ruszkowski explained that the themes of the feedback and data review focused on the following:

- Allow for focus: The system is time-consuming and keeps the evaluator from honing in on key feedback
- Allow for differentiation: Evaluators should spend the most time with those who warrant the most time.
- Allow for peer observation: A "second set of eyes" affirms/pushes an evaluator's judgement and feedback
- Place emphasis on educator development: The authenticity/usefulness of the process is questioned; and

- 99% rated “effective:” All students are not being well-served, yet almost all educators are rated well.

The Board was presented with proposed changes to the language of 106A and how “highly effective” is defined. The proposed changes also allow for teachers rated highly effective for a consistent number of years to forego a summative evaluation for a period of time. It was noted that all of the details to these ideas has not been worked out. Other proposed changes are in Components One through Four which mainly condense the number of criteria or in the case of Component Four, eliminate it or replace it.

Adjournment

The work session adjourned at 10:55 a.m.